

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 17 March 2006. Responsive to that Office Action, Claims 1 – 5 are now amended, and Claims 6 – 9 newly-inserted for further prosecution with the other pending claims. It is believed that with such amendment and insertion of claims, there is a further clarification of the claims' recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 5 under both the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 112. As mentioned, Claims 1 – 5 have been amended. It is believed that these amendments now obviate the Examiner's concerns under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The changes remove the various informalities which had prompted the Examiner's rejections in this regard. Among other things, the changes correct for grammatic and idiomatic errors, and clarify wording to remove certain instances of imprecise English. Support for such clarified wording as "the gelled material at each second selected area thereby becoming hardened in nature," or forming "a corresponding number of stacked sectional layers" is readily found, for instance, at page 3, lines 5 – 21 and page 11, lines 7 – 18 of the Specification in light of the drawings as originally filed. It is thus believed that these and other changes incorporated into the claims hereby introduce no new matter.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Schmidt et al. reference in view of the Murphy et al. reference. In setting forth this rejection, the Examiner acknowledged that Schmidt et al. fails to disclose the step of effecting a physical or chemical change by UV or IR. The Examiner, however, cited Murphy et al. for disclosing this feature, and concluded therefrom that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have accordingly modified the Schmidt et al. process and thereby arrive at the claimed method.

As each of the newly-amended and re-inserted independent Claims 1 and 6 now more clearly recites, Applicant's method includes among its features that of "activating a first physical or chemical change on one or more first selected areas of ... [a] base material by ultra violet beams or infra-red beams," whereby the material becomes "a gelled material." As each of these independent claims further recites, the method includes "activating a second physical or chemical change different from the first" upon "second selected areas of the base material," such that "the gelled material at each second selected area ... becom[es] hardened in nature."

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicants' pending claims is nowhere disclosed by the cited references. As the Examiner readily acknowledged, the primarily-cited Schmidt et al. reference fails to anywhere disclose even the first physical or chemical change by UV or IR.

Beyond that, the Schmidt et al. reference nowhere discloses any “activating [of] a second physical or chemical change different from the first,” much less the activation of such upon a “gelled material” to effect its hardening.

While the secondarily-cited Murphy et al. reference does disclose ultraviolet exposure of a liquid material for its curing to a solid form, it hardly teaches the “selectively activating [of] a second physical or chemical change different from the first,” to prompt a “gelled material at each second selected area [to] thereby becom[e] hardened in nature” (as each of the Claims 1 and 6 now more clearly recites). To the contrary, Murphy et al. specifically prescribes repeating, if necessary, the same, carefully-controlled ultraviolet exposure initially applied to cure the given liquid.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited Schmidt et al. and Murphy et al. references, even when considered together, fail to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by Applicant’s pending claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

MR1917-131
Serial Number: 10/692,813
Response to Office Action Dated 17 March 2006

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully
in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: 7/12/2006

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No.: 04586